


S-2418



PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the application of

Yoshihide HAGIWARA

Serial No. 08/950,902

Group: 1761

Filed: October 15, 1997

Examiner: C. SHERRER

For: PROCESS FOR PRODUCTION OF ALCOHOLIC COFFEE DRINKS

The Honorable Commissioner of
Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

August 10, 1999

COMMUNICATION

Sir:

This is in reply to the Communication from the Examiner
Paper No. 5, mailed August 4, 1999.

According to the Examiner's Communication the reply filed on
June 4, 1999 was not fully responsive to the prior Office Action
(mailed January 8, 1999) because: "there is no argument(s)
directed to the 102(b) rejection based on Adams et al."

With all due respect, Applicants are not aware of any
Section 102(b) rejection based on Adams et al in the Office
Action mailed January 8, 1999, the only prior Office Action in
this application.

A copy of the Action mailed to Applicant is enclosed.

Starting with the page 2, PART III DETAILED ACTION, there
were 23 numbered paragraphs, none of which included a Section
102(b) rejection based on Adams et al.

1761#
6
9-3-99
au

RECEIVED
AUG 11 1999
TC 1700 MAIL ROOM

Specifically, the 23 numbered paragraphs are summarized below.

- ¶1. Acknowledges receipt of priority papers.
- ¶2. Quotation of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.
- ¶3. Claim 6 rejection, 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.
- ¶4. Quotation of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.
- ¶¶5-9. Section 112 rejections of claims 2, 4, 5-7 explained.
- ¶10. Quotation of 35 U.S.C. 102(b).
- ¶11. Claim 8 rejection, 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Papazian.
- ¶12. Explanation of Papazian rejection in ¶11.
- ¶13. Quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- ¶14. Claims 1-5, 7-8 rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Adams et al or Papazian.
- ¶¶15-17. Explanation of Papazian and Adams et al as applied to ¶14 rejection.
- ¶18. Claim 6 rejection, 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Adams et al or Papazian in view of Suzuki.
- ¶19. Explanation of ¶18 rejection.
- ¶20. "No claim is allowed."
- ¶21. Regarding inquiries.
- ¶22. Telephone and facsimile numbers.
- ¶23. Status inquiry phone number.

Accordingly, Applicants disagree that the reply filed on June 4, 1999 was not responsive for failing to reply to a rejection under Section 102(b), namely, a rejection over Adams, et al.

Moreover, it is respectfully pointed out that full and complete responses to each of the rejections in paragraph 3, 11, 14, and 18, were included in the reply filed on June 4, 1999.

Therefore, allowance of the subject application or issuance of a new non-Final Office Action setting forth a new ground of rejection, if appropriate, is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

by Richard A. Steinberg
Richard A. Steinberg
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 26,588

SHERMAN & SHALLOWAY
P.O. Box 788
Alexandria, Virginia 22313
(703) 549-2282